THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, APRIL, 1912

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Oregon, South Dakota, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

"CHIVALROUS COWARDICE."

Writing to the London Outlook, Mrs. Louise Jordan Miln remarks that, if British women get the vote, it will be almost wholly because of the chivalrous cowardice of British men.

This is a graphic phrase, and it describes a malady which prevails on this side of the Atlantic as well as the other.

It is perfectly true that men are ashamed to seem ungenerous to women, and there is considerable danger that, out of false shame and a mistaken chivalry, they may yield to the "Votes for Women" clamor.

A great deal is said about "giving" the vote to women. But, as Mrs. Miln well suggests,—what about thrusting the vote upon woman,—forcing it upon her? That is what American legislatures are being asked to do. There is not a state in the Union where the great majority of the women are not opposed to woman suffrage. The suffragists themselves fully realize this, and therefore always oppose any suggestion for a preliminary referendum to women.

The only way to cope with the "chivalrous cowardice" of men is to make it plain to them where the majority of women stand. When they once grasp the idea that the demand for the ballot comes from only a minority of the women, and that the great majority desire to be delivered from it as an unnecessary and heavy burden, they will see that the course of true chivalry is to protect women from having the ballot thrust upon them.

It follows that, however distasteful the task may be, women who are opposed to the suffrage should make their position clearly known. They should organize to resist woman suffrage just as the minority of women are organized to demand it.

This is what the Anti-Suffrage Associations and Committees are for. Women who realize that the extension of woman suffrage would be a calamity both for themselves and the country should hasten to join these associations or to organize them where they do not now exist.

HOW A WHIRLWIND CAMPAIGN ENDED

AT THE municipal election in Boston last January, Mrs. Susan W. Fitzgerald, secretary of the Massachusetts Equal Suffrage Association, was one of the candidates for school committee. More than ordinary interest attended the issues involved. The Woman's Journal devoted many columns to advocating Mrs. Fitzgerald's election; and Mrs. Fitzgerald herself made a "whirlwind campaign" in her automobile. Yet, out of perhaps 120,000 women entitled to register, only 12,255, or about one tenth, did so; and of these only 6350 or about one half, took the trouble to go to the polls. If Mrs. Fitzgerald and her supporters had tried to demonstrate the indifference of the great majority of women to the ballot, they could not have done better.

A TOUCHING APPEAL

The Woman's Journal is sending out the following touching appeal to its subscribers. THE REMONSTRANCE feels that it is rendering a service to a distressed contemporary by giving it the benefit of its circulation:

Dear Friend:

Some of the best advertising agencies refuse to give us their advertisements because they believe that women suffragists do not marry and do not have children. They believe that it is the exceptional suffragist who marries and brings up a family.

We know that this is absurd, but we need to convince them. Will you, therefore, fill out the enclosed blank, cut it off and send it to us by return mail? We dislike to bother you with this, but we believe that you will be willing to do it when we tell you that good advertisements depend upon it.

Yours sincerely,

AGNES E. RYAN.

Have you any children? ——— How many? ———. How many suffragists of your acquaintance are mothers? ———. What is the average size of the "suffrage family" from your observation? ———.

Name ———

Address ——— ———

BETTER LAWS IN NON-SUFFRAGE STATES

THE Milwaukee Free Press, having been challenged by Miss Ada James, President of the Political Equality League of Wisconsin, to name any state which has as many laws pertaining to the welfare of women and children as are to be found in Colorado and other woman suffrage states, promptly accepted the challenge, and, in its issue for February 15 printed a comparison in parallel columns.

The Free Press accepted Miss James's epitome of legislation in suffrage states as accurate. It contained nineteen specifications. Over against these the Free Press placed

a summary of Wisconsin laws of a similar character. The comparison shows that, with two or three unimportant exceptions, Wisconsin has laws closely corresponding to those cited from the woman suffrage states, in some instances stronger and more protective; and that, besides, it has nineteen other laws to promote the welfare of women and children for which there are no parallels in any of the suffrage states.

A single instance may be cited. A Wisconsin law forbids girls under 18 to engage in street trades, and boys under 21 to do night messenger work in large cities. But the Colorado legislature, at its last session,—with four women in its membership—enacted a law which permits girls over 10 to engage in street trades and boys over 16 to do night messenger work in large cities. This law, the Free Press plainly says, "is one of the most damnable recently passed in this country"; and Mrs. Florence Kelley remarks upon it: "Even in sinful New York, girls below the age of 16 years have for many years been effectively banished from street trades."

This comparison completely refutes the argument that it is necessary to give women the ballot in order to secure laws for the protection of women and children. The best examples of such laws are in non-suffrage states.

FOR EVERY JACK A JILL

(From the *Boot and Shoe Recorder*, Jan. 24.

One great trouble with the present regime is that the electorate is unwieldy, and good government ideas are submerged and lost sight of in the confusion. The corrupt politicians marshal their forces with the certainty that the low and ignorant vote will always be there to be counted. There is too much "organized ignorance" in both parties. But for every degree and grade of masculine ignorance it is quite likely that a corresponding example of feminine ignorance may be found. The old English saw runs: "For every Jack there's a Jill." Merely multiplying the electorate by two will not necessarily improve its quality.

WINDOW SMASHING SUFFRAGETTES

Mrs. Pankhurst and the militant suffragettes who follow her ran amuck in London on the 1st and 4th of March, smashing shop windows along the Strand, Haymarket, Piccadilly, Bond, Oxford and Regent streets and all through the West End. Mrs. Pankhurst herself drove to Premier Asquith's residence, and, handing a letter to a servant at the door, threw two stones into the hall, and also broke the windows on the ground floor. Another woman fired a shot from a revolver through the window of the Colonial Office and another tried to set fire to the General Post Office. Altogether, several hundred women participated in these outrages, and about two hundred arrests were made. Most of the women concerned carried stones and hammers concealed in their muffs, and, alighting from taxicabs at the shop entrances, as if they were intending purchasers, proceeded to wreck the plate glass windows. The damage to the shopkeepers is estimated at $25,000.

It is not necessary to repeat the details of this senseless performance which have been sufficiently reported in the daily press. It would have been just as rational and would have had just as much bearing upon the suffrage question if the suffragettes had swarmed upon the streets from their headquarters and assaulted every passer-by.

It is not surprising that the London magistrates should have lost their patience and declined to show special consideration to the lawless women brought before them. Very properly, they treated the suffragette hooligans like other hooligans, and added hard labor to their sentences. Also, as the demonstration had evidently been carefully organized, the police raided the office of "Votes for Women," arrested the editors, and from the documentary evidence obtained proceeded against the leaders on a charge of conspiracy, which, if sustained, may entail a seven years' sentence.

The effect of this outbreak upon American public opinion is indicated by the editorial utterances, elsewhere quoted, of the Boston Evening Transcript, a journal often regarded as friendly to the suffrage cause, and the New York Evening Post, an ardent partisan of it.

A LEAGUE FOR "SOCIAL ORDER"

The anti-suffrage cause is strongly re-enforced in New York city by the organization of The League for Social Order, with the threefold aim of opposing easy divorce, socialism and woman suffrage.

The President of the new society is Miss Mary L. Stebbins, the Secretary, Mrs. Julian Heath, and the Treasurer, Rossiter Johnson. The Vice Presidents are Mrs. Emil Kuichling, Dr. Arthur Randolph Green, the Rev. Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst, the Rev. Dr. Rudolph Grossman, and William J. O'Donnell. The honorary officers include Cardinal Farley, Bishop Doane, Henry Clews, John D. Crimmins, Miss Molly Elliot Seawell, Theron G. Strong, and Mrs. Bayard Taylor.

Upon woman suffrage, the League makes the following declaration:

While we favor every legitimate development of woman's personality, we are opposed to the woman suffrage movement, which proposes a fundamental change in the relationship of the sexes to each other and to the Government and displays a marked tendency to identify itself with the forces of social disorder.

GAINING A NEW PLAYTHING

(From the Grand Rapids, Michigan, Press)

Many men, rightly or wrongly, believe that the suffrage movement in Michigan is backed very largely by those who find in the campaign a convenient means for putting in their spare time, for gaining a new plaything and possibly for getting their names in the newspapers. Certainly one has to look sharply to find in their ranks representatives of the army of women in this state who are doing their own housework, sewing, baking, mending their husbands' clothes and raising children.

ANOTHER DEFEAT FOR MASSACHUSETTS SUFFRAGISTS

There was a large attendance, but no turbulent or spectacular demonstrations, at the hearing at the State House, on the evening of February 26, before the legislative Committee on Constitutional Amendments, on petitions asking for an amendment to the Constitution striking the word "male" from the qualifications for voters. For three and one half hours, an orderly assemblage listened to the arguments and testimony, the time being equally divided between petitioners and remonstrants.

Three petitions, accompanied by the same resolve, were before the committee: one presented by Alice Stone Blackwell and others; one from the Socialist Party Clubs of Massachusetts; and one from the Massachusetts State Branch of the American Federation of Labor. The case for the petitioners was conducted by La Rue Brown, John Weaver Sherman and Victor J. McCome. Charles R. Saunders, counsel for the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, conducted the case for the remonstrants.

Miss Mary S. Ames,
President of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, presented the formal remonstrance to the petition on behalf of the more than 16,000 women included in the membership of that association. These women, Miss Ames stated, live in 349 cities, towns and villages, from Cape Cod to Berkshire. They represent all conditions of life: many of them are taxpayers, many are wage earners, but all agree in wishing to retain their present rights and exemptions. Their only fear is that a mistaken generosity on the part of men may induce some legislature to give favorable consideration to such petitions as those now under consideration. Miss Ames pointed to some of the burdens which the extension of the suffrage would impose upon women, and emphasized the advantages which women now enjoy in standing outside of politics, and being able to render various sorts of public, educational and charitable service, without any suspicion of wishing to serve personal or party interests.

Miss Minnie J. Bronson
was the next speaker. She said that she was a single woman, a wage-earner and a taxpayer, and therefore if any woman needed the ballot, as the petitioners claim, she met all the requirements. She spoke of her investigations while employed in the Bureau of Labor in the United States Department of Labor and Commerce, which had enabled her to gather much important information at first hand. "If the ballot would bring about better things," she said, she would wish to ally herself with the petitioners; but no line of argument was more futile than the statement that the ballot would raise the wages of women. The laws already on the statute books are better for the protection of women than for the protection of men. Miss Bronson stated facts as to the laws and the working of the laws in many states. She spoke of Colorado from personal knowledge, and contrasted it, not with Massachusetts, but with the neighboring state, Nebraska, declaring that the laws for women are better in the male suffrage states than in the woman suffrage states. She told of 54 laws in 38 states, and gave many illustrations of their working, mainly from the economic point of view. She described the work of women in the industrial world, and declared that their achievements and advancement without the ballot clearly proved the ballot unnecessary, while she expressed her sincere belief and conviction, founded on careful study in many states, that the ballot is detrimental to women.

Prof. William T. Sedgwick,
of the Institute of Technology, was then called upon and spoke in substance as follows:

I oppose this proposal for many reasons, but especially because I believe that woman suffrage would be at once harmful to women and harmful to the State.

It would be harmful to women because it would impose upon them new and heavy and needless burdens, compelling them to devote time and thought and labor to work for which they are physically poorly fitted and for which they are in no respect mentally any better qualified than men. Most women are physically incapacitated at times and hence unfitted for long continued and exciting political or public service, and you, gentlemen of the Committee, know that practical politics is not an afternoon tea party.

It would be harmful to the State because it would double the number of voters without increasing the intelligence of the vote. And by withdrawing women from the protection of homes and workshops and thrusting them into the limelight,—upon the stump, and into the caucus, the town hall and the jury box,—it would, in my opinion, do irreparable harm to the community, in which women now form an invaluable conservative, because disinterested, influence.

A chart like that [referring to a table of figures shown on the wall by the petitioners and giving certain rates of infant mortality in various countries] is for the purposes of this hearing worthless because it does not state upon what data it is based, and to conclude as has been done by the other side that infant mortality is low in certain countries because these have woman suffrage is absurd and ridiculous. The same countries probably have also a low general death rate, and statisticians have hitherto held that this was because the population was largely rural and composed mostly of young people. It seems, however, that the authorities have been all wrong, and that woman suffrage is a kind of elixir of life.

The "new" woman dabbling in this way in things like these makes some of us men—and especially some of us scientific men—sceptical about the alleged advantages coming to the State from any extension of woman suffrage. I believe that men are men and women are women, and that since they are physically and mentally very different any attempt to make them do exactly the same work is doomed to failure from the start. Hence, also, I regard the whole woman suffrage movement as a reactionary, rather than a progressive, movement.

Mr. Charles R. Saunders
of Boston, said in part:

There ought to be no antagonism between the women here. Each side is striving in its own way for the elevation of the race, and of women in particular. The anti-suffragists, however, do not regard woman as simply undeveloped man, but as a different being, with aptitudes and excellences of her own to develop. The suffragists *seem* to consider woman's highest aim to be to ape man's work and strive with him in his field of labor—as Miss Ida M. Tarbell puts it in the current number of the American Magazine, to "make a man

of herself." This suffrage view may be flattering to the Committee and to some other persons present, but it is utterly unscientific, and fraught with peril to woman and to the Commonwealth.

The 16,000 Massachusetts women whom I represent object to the concession to themselves of so-called "rights," which they regard as intolerable burdens, and they object to the concession to other women of powers which they believe the recipients could not exercise with advantage to the community.

In their earnest desire to be relieved from political turmoil, in order to devote themselves unreservedly to their own tasks, the remonstrants know that they represent the great majority of their sex—95 per cent. at least in Massachusetts. They ask you not to be misled by any false sense of chivalry into forcing them into the turbulent arena of politics. They ask you to remember that you cannot grant the request of the petitioners without ignoring the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the sex in Massachusetts, represented by them.

They ask you to be strong enough and manly enough to perform these political duties yourselves, without attempting to share them with those already weighted and less able to bear the strain.

Adverse Report

March 12, the Committee on Constitutional Amendments reported to the Senate "leave to withdraw" on all the petitions, without a dissenting vote.

Defeated in the Senate

March 20, in the Senate, a motion to substitute the resolve for the adverse report was defeated by a vote of 17 yeas to 20 nays, including pairs.

Defeated in the House

April 2, in the House, a motion to substitute the resolve for the report was defeated by a vote of 96 yeas to 116 nays, including pairs. The vote was on the resolve accompanying the petition of Miss Blackwell and others. The adverse reports on the other petitions and on the Governor's recommendation that the question be submitted to popular vote were accepted without a division.

CAMBRIDGE AS A CASE IN POINT

The vote for school committee at the city election in Cambridge on the 12th of March goes to prove two of the points for which anti-suffragists have always contended.

The first is the fluctuating character of the women's vote. In 1911, there were 1,892 women voters registered in Cambridge. Of these, only 56 or less than three per cent., took the trouble to go to the polls to vote. But this year, under especially exciting conditions, the registration of women rose to 6,182, and of these 5,394 voted.

The second point is that to thrust the ballot upon women is to impose upon them unwelcome responsibilities. It is often lightly said that if women do not want to vote they would not have to, if the suffrage were extended to them. But this is not true. The sense of responsibility would compel them, however reluctant they might be. Among the new women voters in Cambridge this year, who spent hours in waiting at the registration places and went to the polls for the first time, there were hundreds who are wholly opposed to woman suffrage. But they were alarmed by an attempt to get the public schools under political control, and they acted accordingly.

If the full ballot were extended to women, this is what would happen at every election. Conscientious women who had opposed woman suffrage would feel morally bound to vote, to offset the votes of other women of ignorant or dangerous classes whose votes were controlled by unscrupulous politicians.

In Cambridge, there was only a single issue involved. But, with the full ballot, there would be numerous questions at all elections, which would force women with consciences to acquaint themselves with public issues, political platforms, and the character and position of candidates, and to take part in primaries as well as elections.

"MACHINE" WOMEN AND THE "VICE TRUST"

(From the *Chicago Public* (a woman suffrage paper) Dec. 1, 1911)

Why not recognize that under woman suffrage there will be "machine" women as well as "machine" men, as long as there are "machines"; and that well-meaning women voters as well as well-meaning men voters will be fooled by those that are not well-meaning? These weaknesses, whether in church or business or frou-frou society, are neither masculine nor feminine but human.

In Denver, three progressive women had been nominated for the legislature against the women referred to by THE REMONSTRANCE"*; but the corporations and the vice trust—together with some really good men and possibly some really good women—all of it as human as the apple episode in Eden—combined against them. So the progressive women were defeated by a small plurality, and those whom THE REMONSTRANCE sets up as types of womanhood in civic action were elected.

But for that narrow plurality, there might have been no necessity for Governor Shafroth's veto of a gambling measure passed with women's votes, nor any difficulty in securing women sponsors in the legislature for Judge Lindsey's child-labor bill.

*THE REMONSTRANCE for October, 1911, and January, 1912.

WHERE THE MAJORITY STAND

(From *The Waltham News*, Jan. 18, 1912)

IT is an undeniable fact that the majority of women do not care for the vote. The sensible woman with mind and tact knows that she can exercise a greater influence on public matters through womanliness than through aping masculinity. The average woman prefers to confine herself to those spheres which are essentially hers.

MICHIGAN is added to the list of states which are to vote upon woman suffrage amendments at the fall elections. The resolution providing for submitting the amendment was rushed through, the last week in March, at a special session of the legislature which had been convened for a different purpose.

LONDON'S BROKEN WINDOWS

(From the *Boston Evening Transcript*, Mar. 2, 1912)

More than a million miners in Great Britain have quit work, and several hundred viragoes, who euphemistically style themselves militant Suffragettes, have given that great idle army an exhibition of the way it may conduct itself for the purpose of winning its contention. The window-breaking campaign in London yesterday went farther than any of its predecessors in premeditated violence and malicious mischief. It was a running-a-muck demonstration, because there was no discrimination as to victims. The most costly plate glass windows of the finest shops were the shining marks, and whether the property of friends or foes it was all one to this strange mob, which started out for a war upon society.

Doubtless those who took part in the insane movement, in their calmer moments would resent being called uncivilized, or even unrefined. They represented classes and circles that have been looked to in the past for sane counsel and improving influences. Very likely there were titled women who threw their hats in the ring. It was evidently lightning from a clear sky, for the police of the city were unprepared for such a vicious manifestation, and the porters of the shops in giving them a courteous reception were so taken by surprise that they did not recover in time to interfere until the mischief had been done and the perpetrators had made their escape in the crowds that they were certain to attract. And the purpose of all this was ostensibly to prove the fitness of those engaged in these anarchistic exercises to have and use the ballot.

HURTING THE CAUSE

(From the *New York Evening Post*, Mar. 4, 1912)

The latest outbreaks of the militant Suffragists in England cannot but hurt the cause. To attack Government offices and to set fire to a post office is surely bad enough; to destroy the property of innocent shopkeepers—who may at heart desire the enfranchisement of women—seems to us an act of utter folly.

Yet we learn that tonight there is to be a demonstration which will "startle all the world." With every possible legitimate protest we are heartily in sympathy. We do not deny, too, the enormous advertising advantage derived from the earlier outbreaks. But terrorism is terrorism, wherever undertaken, whether by labor unions in Los Angeles or in Indianapolis, or by Suffragettes in London. In the long run peaceful agitation wins where a cause is just, and a cause which is buttressed by sound reasons is the last one that should turn to brute force and the destruction of property to achieve its ends. The disfranchised Prussian men who so earnestly seek the ballot have set an admirable example in this respect to Mrs. Pankhurst's followers.

RAIDING THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Chicago suffragists are aggrieved because Dr. McFatrich, president of the Board of Education, has ruled that equal suffrage must not be taught in the public schools. Dr. Anna E. Blount, one of the suffrage leaders who protest against this ruling, declares that "the public will refuse to allow any one man to keep the teaching of equal suffrage away from their children"; and Mrs. George W. Trout, president of the Chicago Political League, states that already "many teachers are daily talking equal suffrage to their pupils." If this is true, such teachers cannot too soon be removed, for they wholly misunderstand their vocation. The public schools, supported by public money, are no place for such a propaganda; and the amazing thing is not that school authorities should place a ban upon it, but that any one should have the effrontery to undertake or defend it.

JU-JUTSU FOR SUFFRAGETTES

THE DRIFT of the English suffragette movement is strikingly shown by the following advertisement, which appears in a recent number of the London "Votes for Women."

"Ju-Jutsu (self-defence) for Suffragettes, private or class lessons daily, 10.30 to 7.30; special terms to W. S. P. U. members; Sunday class by arrangement; Boxing and Fencing by specialists.—*Edith Garrud, 9, Argyll Place, Regent Street*

"IN A RELIGIOUS SPIRIT."

The Woman's Journal of March 9th gave four of its news columns and nearly a column of editorial comment to the lawless outbreak of the London suffragettes.

The significant thing in the editorial comment was that it contained not a single word of criticism or disapproval. But the "courage and devotion" and the "organizing genius" of the women were eulogized; and Miss Blackwell, who signed the editorials with her initials, declared that the Pankhurst suffragettes "throw their stones and go to prison in a positively religious spirit."

AN UNFOUNDED ASSUMPTION

(Frederic L. Paxson in the *New York Nation*, Feb. 8, 1912)

The value placed upon suffrage by its advocates compels the student of institutions to question the complete capacity of even the leaders of the feminist agitation. After allowing for all the factors of strife and exaggeration essential to a propaganda there remains behind the movement the assumption that the evils of today would not exist if women voted. Too often their arguments seem to imply that women are so much more intelligent, honest, and virtuous than the men whom they have trained that the faults of masculine government will be swept away at once. Nothing but a belief in the reality of such reform could justify the virulent speech and lawless conduct of the most militant of the reformers. Yet were all women the civic equals of the small class of independent women, there are grave doubts whether they would outrank the men in any virtues save those which sex has fastened upon them. They are not trained to the honesty that is the backbone of masculine business. Contractual relations and compromise do not enter into their daily routine. In public and in private they are more interested in carrying the point than in doing abstract justice. That the mass of women are now, or are likely in the near future to be, the civic equals of their husbands and brothers, it is impossible to believe. Civic virtue does not come from a clean heart alone. It comes from a first-hand knowledge of the workings of social forces.

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

TENNYSON said that woman was *not* "undeveloped man." He was evidently mistaken. The Suffragists say that is just what she is, and prove it.

THE REMONSTRANCE has the pleasure of recording in this number the organization of six new associations, —in Connecticut, New Hampshire, Ohio, Virginia, Wisconsin and Washington, D. C. This, certanly, is a good record for a single quarter.

IN Maryland, February 29th, the House, by a vote of 74 to 18, rejected the Campbell bill, which provided for state-wide woman suffrage through a constitutional amendment. The adverse majority was 13 larger than was given against a similar proposition two years ago; from which it would appear that the suffrage cause in that state is progressing backward.

ONE often meets nowadays women who suffer a burning sense of humiliation in living under man-made laws. But has any one yet met a woman who objected to walking on man-made pavements, travelling in man-made railway trains or inhabiting man-made houses? Men are still permitted to build sewers and set up overhead wires, and no women stokers for steamships, nor crews for whalers, have yet crowded the professions.

MAINE SUFFRAGISTS have exulted over the fact that the Maine Grange, at its Lewiston meeting, adopted a resolution pledging itself to start a campaign to secure names for the initiative on a measure for equal suffrage to be presented to the next legislature. But whoever framed this resolution and the delegates who voted for it seem to have forgotten that woman suffrage involves an amendment to the constitution; and that the initiative, in the form in which it exists in Maine, does not apply to the organic law.

OHIO, as well as Virginia, furnishes an illustration of the increasing disposition of conservative women to organize against woman suffrage, as soon as an emergency arises, even when no preliminary steps have been taken. The Ohio women made a strong presentation of the anti-suffrage case before the committee of the constitutional convention, and secured more than a thousand signatures to anti-suffrage petitions in one week. They did not succeed in the convention, which was an extremely radical body, but the state organization which they formed and which is included in the list elsewhere printed will take an active part in the campaign when the proposal goes before the people.

In New Jersey, the suffragists made but a poor showing. The proposed suffrage amendment to the constitution was defeated in the Senate, March 19, by a vote of 17 to 3. On the same day the New York legislature acted adversely upon a similar amendment. In the Senate a motion to strike out the enacting clause of the bill to submit the amendment was carried in committee of the whole, 24 to 17. A motion to disagree with this action failed by a vote of 19 yeas to 21 nays. To pass the bill 26 votes were needed. In the Assembly a motion to disagree with the adverse report of the Judiciary Committee received 68 yeas to 63 nays; but 76 votes were needed to pass the bill. In Ohio, the constitutional convention has voted to submit a woman suffrage amendment as a separate proposition. The proposed new constitution and amendments will be submitted to the people at a special election, probably in July or August. In Kentucky a school suffrage bill has been passed. An educational qualification was attached, which does not apply to male voters. In Chicago, County Judge Owens, at the solicitation of the suffragists and upon their offer to bear any extra expense, has authorized a vote upon the general proposition of the extension of suffrage to women, at the primary election April 9. This is described by the New York Evening Post,—a paper favorable to suffrage —as "a sentimental poll." The Post adds: "There is no telling what other organizations may request that the voters be given an opportunity to say what they think about something or other."

SYMPATHY FOR MRS. PANKHURST

After the recent window-smashing demonstration in London, a suffragist mass meeting in Detroit which had just listened to Miss Sylvia Pankhurst sent a cable message to Premier Asquith, asking for the enfranchisement of "brave English women"; and also sent a special message of sympathy to Mrs. Pankhurst's organization, the Women's Social and Political Union.

Apropos of this, the Detroit Free Press of March 6 remarked:

While Sylvia Pankhurst was illumining this fair town with her presence she made this Sibylline utterance:

"In opposing suffrage, Lyman Abbott said that government was based on force. How absurd this remark is when we realize that the time of universal peace is surely coming."

Were Miss Sylvia with us now, she would need only to point with pride to the activities of her fellow suffragettes in London in order to squelch Brother Abbott forever. The women in prison and the women out of prison are singing the Marsellaise. Mrs. Frederick Pethick Lawrence, an editor of a propagandist paper, has announced that the women will not hesitate to burn a royal palace if the act becomes necessary, and she added that "If Friday's methods were not strong enough we will terrorize the whole country."

As Miss Sylvia says, government is no longer based on force, and the time of universal peace is surely coming. The suffragettes are ushering in the joyous era.

AN EMBARRASSING ALLIANCE

IN WISCONSIN, the suffragists are trying to persuade the Woman's Christian Temperance Union to keep out of the suffrage campaign. But the temperance women are not pleased at the thought of any alliance, open or covert, between the suffragists and the brewing interests, and are not inclined to be pushed aside. Mrs. W. A. Lawson, President of the Wisconsin W. C. T. U., declares that that organization has always stood for woman suffrage, and that the suffrage movement owes its present prominence to the exertions of the temperance women. On the other hand, she says that "The suffrage organizations are only spasmodic workers."

ENGLISH SUFFRAGISTS DEFEATED

The vote in the House of Commons March 28th, on the so-called "Conciliation" suffrage bill, makes it plain that promiscuous window-smashing and other "militant" antics of Mrs. Pankhurst and her followers do not advance but retard "votes for women."

The House of Commons, amid "deafening cheers," rejected the suffrage bill on its second reading, by a vote of 222 to 208.

It has been the practice of the House of Commons to allow these bills to take their second reading without serious opposition. Last year a bill similar to that just rejected passed the second reading stage by a vote of 255 to 88. The suffragists described this as "an overwhelming victory," oblivious of the fact that nearly one half of the 670 members of the House of Commons did not vote either way.

What has happened to reduce the suffrage vote from 255 a year ago to 208 this year, and to increase the anti-suffrage vote from 88 last year to 222 this year? Simply the reckless rioting of the suffragettes. The House of Commons has served notice upon the irresponsible "militants" that it will not concede to hooliganism what it could not yield to rational argument. The vote of rejection was probably made more emphatic by the unwillingness of the Irish members to have Home Rule obstructed, but the main cause of the change of attitude of the House of Commons was the rioting of the 1st, 4th and 8th of March.

The rejection of this bill is a bitter disappointment to the suffragists. They had hoped to get this or some suffrage bill through the various stages in the House of Commons, so that they might claim Mr. Asquith's promise to incorporate it as an amendment in the government's manhood suffrage bill. To have it rejected on the first stage,—action on which has hitherto been perfunctory—is a heavy blow to their cause, and must lead the suffragist leaders to consider the wisdom of putting an end to militantism.

A VIRGINIA PROTEST

One of the most encouraging signs of the times is the increasing disposition of conservative women to make their opposition to woman suffrage known. Even in states where these women are not organized, when an emergency arises, it often finds them prepared to meet it.

This was the case in Virginia last January, when a petition signed by representative women of the state, protesting against the proposed suffrage amendment, was presented to the House Committee on Privileges and Elections. The signers included wage earners, school teachers and college graduates, and women who were presidents or prominent officers of social, literary, patriotic, charitable, church and missionary associations, day nurseries, kindergartens, orphan asylums and hospitals. The case against woman suffrage, from a woman's point of view, has rarely been so effectively presented as in this protest, the concluding paragraphs of which are given below:

"We believe that:

'If the suffrage movement were to disband today and no woman ever vote, not a single great interest would suffer. None of woman's wide philanthropies would be harmed; women's colleges would be unaffected; the professions would continue to give diplomas to qualified women; tradesmen would still employ women; good laws would not be repealed; literature would not suffer; homes would be no less secure; woman's civic work would not cease; nor would there be any more disposition than there is today to remove to a state where women already have the ballot.'

Where better laws are necessary for women or children, education, temperance or general morality, we believe their enactment could be assured with one tenth of the time and energy,—and none of the money—employed in gaining members for the Equal Suffrage League.

We are, therefore, unable to see where there is any necessity for this amendment to the Constitution of Virginia. At the same time, we know that conditions render such an amendment inexpedient and dangerous in this State—conditions which do not exist in any female suffrage State or country in the world.

It has seemed to us that true patriotism would not seek to aggravate this troublous problem.

In conclusion, we will only say that we are convinced that a body of intelligent, capable and conscientious persons, bound by no party ties, divided by no factional disputes, and far above all suspicion of self-interest, is of infinite value to any country or State.

We ask of you nothing but the continuance of our political independence.

We need all our time and strength and thought for the work which we alone can do,—do not ask us to bear your burdens as well as our own.

Believing that 'in quietness and in confidence shall be our strength,' we leave our case in your hands."

The confidence expressed in the closing sentence was not misplaced. The foregoing protest was filed with the Committee January 18. Five days later, the Committee, by a practically unanimous vote, reported against the suffrage amendment. The Senate Committee Jan. 29 reported unanimously against the amendment, and on the 8th of February the House rejected it with hardly a dissenting vote.

THE VULGARIZING OF WOMAN

An anomalous point in the handling of the question of Woman's Suffrage in this country in the last sixty-five years has been the vulgarizing of the woman it sought to dignify. Suffragists have been in the habit of focussing attention on the limitations and hardships of woman's life, attributing them almost exclusively to the lack of the ballot. To excite enthusiasm for their cure they have directly or by implication belittled woman's function and position and pictured the higher and nobler place the ballot would give her. The general result of this insistent and exclusive emphasis has been to strip woman of the honor of a dignified past, to obscure the fine and subtle qualities which differentiate her from man, and to make her holiest function a thing to be apologized for.—From Ida M. Tarbell's Introduction to "The Book of Woman's Power" (The Macmillan Co.)

State Organizations Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

MASSACHUSETTS

Forty-one Branch Committees; 16,083 members in 349 cities, towns, and villages.*

MISS MARY S. AMES, President.

MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,
MISS AGNES IRWIN,
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,
Vice-Presidents.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer, Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y.
Room 615 Kensington Building, Boston.

* *Net present membership of women over 21 years of age: eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations and removals from the State.*

NEW YORK

MRS. WILLIAM A. PUTNAM, President.

Honorary Vice-Presidents.

MRS. ELIHU ROOT,
MRS. FRANCIS M. SCOTT,
MRS. RICHARD WATSON GILDER,
MRS. ARTHUR M. DODGE, First Vice-President.

Vice-Presidents,

MISS ELEANOR G. HEWITT,
MRS. ROBERT McVICKAR,
MRS. GEORGE DOUGLAS MILLER,
MRS. W. PHELPS NORTHRUP,
MRS. CHARLTON T. LEWIS, Treasurer.
MRS. M. E. LOOMIS, Secretary.

Chairmen of Auxiliaries

MRS. WINSLOW CRANNELL, Albany.
MRS. WILLIAM A. PUTNAM, Brooklyn.
MRS. WILLIAM P. NORTHRUP, Buffalo.
MRS. ROBERT McVICKAR, Mt. Vernon.
MRS. HENRY F. BURTON, Rochester.
MRS. J. K. PAIGE, Schenectady,
MRS. JOHN W. GILLETTE, Hudson.

ILLINOIS

MRS. CAROLINE F. CORBIN, President.
MRS. S. M. NICKERSON,
MRS. R. J. OGLESBY,
MRS. J. M. WALKER,
Vice-Presidents.
MRS. T. B. BLACKSTONE,
MISS J. C. FAIRFIELD, Secretary and Treasurer,
1523 Dearborn Avenue, Chicago.

OREGON

MRS. FRANCIS J. BAILEY, President, Alexandra Court, Portland.
MISS FAILING,
MRS. R. W. WILBUR,
Vice-Presidents.
MRS. WALLACE McCAMANT, Treasurer.
MISS ELEANOR E. GILE, Secretary.

Executive Committee

MRS. HENRY W. CORBETT,
MRS. HELEN LADD CORBETT,
MRS. J. B. MONTGOMERY,
MRS. A. E. ROCKEY,
MRS. C. H. LEWIS,
MRS. ELIZABETH HAMILTON,
MRS. DAVID LORING,
MRS. HERBERT HOLMAN.

IOWA COMMITTEE

MRS. MARTIN FLYNN, President.
MRS. SIMON CASADY, Secretary.
MRS. JOHN H. MERRILL,
MISS SARAH NOLLEN,
MRS. FRANK D. JACKSON,
MRS. H. C. ALVERSON,
MISS KATHERINE G. WILLIS,
MRS. H. C. POTTER,
MRS. H. H. POLK,
MRS. ALEXANDER FITZHUGH. Des Moines.
MISS ALICE FRENCH, Davenport.
MRS. A. J. VANDUZEE, Dubuque.

VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION

MRS. HUNSDON CARY, Richmond, Temporary Chairman.
MRS. CHILES FERRELL, Richmond, Secretary and Treasurer.

PENNSYLVANIA

MRS. J. GARDNER CASSATT, President.

Vice-Presidents.

MRS. FRANK SAMUEL, First Vice-Prest.
MRS. WILLIAM W. BIRDSALL,
MRS. HORACE BROCK,
MISS SOPHY D. IRWIN,
MRS. JAMES LARGE,
MRS. WILLIAM L. McLEAN,
MISS MARY NEWHALL,
MISS ELISE WILLING BALCH, Treasurer.
MRS. CHARLES BINGHAM PENROSE, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. BRINTON COXE, Cor. Sec'y.

Executive Committee

MISS CORNELIA E. BEDFORD,
MRS. EDWARD BROWNING,
MRS. ARTHUR M. COMEY,
MRS. SAMUEL GRANT DIEHL,
MRS. JOSEPH M. FOX,
MRS. FRANK TRACY GRISWOLD,
MRS. HORACE BINNEY HARE,
MISS JULIA M. KEIM,
MRS. JOHN MARKOE,
MRS. CHARLES M. MOTT,
MISS MARY ELLIS THOMPSON,
MRS. JOHN THOMPSON SPENCER,
MRS. JAMES FRANCIS SULLIVAN,
MRS. CHARLES WHEELER,
MRS. RODMAN WISTER.

MARYLAND

MRS. ROBERT GARRETT, President.

Vice-Presidents.

MRS. FRANCIS T. REDWOOD,
MRS. JOHN HASLUP ADAMS,
MRS. ARTHUR B. KINSOLVING,
MISS CATHARINE M. SELFE,

MRS. CHARLES B. PENROSE, Treasurer.

MRS. FRANCIS T. REDWOOD,
MISS AMELIE DU P. FOWLER,
MISS LOUISE MOORE,
MRS. OSCAR LESER,
Executive Board
MRS. CLAUDE HALL, Rec. Sec'y.
MISS KATHARINE FARQUHAR DAVIS, Cor. Sec'y.

MADISON, WISCONSIN, ASSOCIATION

MRS. FRANK W. HOYT, President.
MRS. VICTOR LENHER,
MRS. REUBEN GOLD THWAITES,
Vice-Presidents.
MRS. JOSEPH W. HOBBINS, Treasurer.
MISS KAYUTAH FERRAR, Rec. Sec'y.
MISS GENEVIEVE M. MILLS, Cor. Sec'y.

Board of Directors

MRS. FRANK W. HOYT,
MRS. VICTOR LENHER,
MRS. CHARLES BUELL,
MRS. MARGARET FORD,
MRS. JOSEPH W. HOBBINS,
MRS. F. W. MONTGOMERY,
DR. SARAH G. VERNON,
MRS. ELIZABETH GARDINER,
MRS. JAMES A. DAVIDSON,
MRS. R. G. THWAITES,
MRS. FRANK C. SHARP,
MRS. PHYLLIS FRAWLEY,
MRS. T. C. McCARTHY,
MRS. GEORGE C. COMSTOCK,
MRS. ALBERT G. SHRUEDEMAN,
MRS. WILLET S. MAIN,
MRS. SAMUEL H. MOORE,
MISS KAYUTAH FERRAR,
MISS GENEVIEVE M. MILLS.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Concord Branch

MRS. EDSON J. HILL, President.

Vice-Presidents

MRS. BURNS P. HODGMAN,
MRS. THOMAS C. BETHUNE,
MRS. HENRY W. STEVENS,
MISS GRACE MORRILL.

MRS. OTIS G. HAMMOND, Secretary.
MISS CARRIE R. TODD, Treasurer.

Portsmouth Branch

MRS. BARRETT WENDELL, President.
MRS. JOHN W. KELLEY, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. WALLIS D. WALKER, Cor. Sec'y.
MISS MARION HACKETT, Treasurer.

Exeter Branch

MRS. A. T. DUDLEY, Chairman.
MISS MABEL DANA, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. J. G. W. KNOWLTON, Treasurer.

CONNECTICUT

MRS. DANIEL A. MARKHAM, President.

Vice-Presidents

MISS ELIZABETH R. BURNELL,
MRS. CHARLES C. BEACH,
MISS MARTHA J. WILKINSON.

MRS. JOHN L. BUNCE, Secretary.
MRS. ALBERT S. COOK, Treasurer.

Board of Directors

MRS. WILLIAM H. PALMER,
MRS. LEVERETT BRAINARD,
MRS. ANSEL G. COOK,
MRS. JAMES GOODWIN,
MRS. JACOB H. GREENE,
MRS. CHARLES H. TALCOTT,
MRS. THOMAS R. LOOMIS,
MRS. GAIL B. MUNSILL,
MISS EDITH BEACH,
MRS. JOHN W. COOGAN,
MRS. FREDERICK T. SIMPSON,
MRS. CHARLES H. LAWRENCE.

RHODE ISLAND

MRS. ROWLAND G. HAZARD, President.
MISS LOUISE C. HOPPIN,
MRS. HOWARD O. STURGIS,
MRS. S. O. METCALF,
Vice-Presidents.
MRS. ALBERT G. HARKNESS, Secretary.
MRS. ELISHA HOWARD, Treasurer.

Standing Committee

MRS. FREDERICK C. HOPPIN,
MISS TAFT,
MRS. ROBERT I. GAMMELL,
MRS. WILLIAM GAMMELL,
MRS. G. ALDER BLUMER,
MISS M. E. SMITH,
MRS. GEORGE J. ARNOLD,
MRS. THOMAS H. CARRIQUE.

MAINE COMMITTEE

MRS. SIDNEY W. THAXTER, Secretary. Portland.
MRS. CHARLES S. OGDEN, Portland.
MRS. JAMES P. BAXTER, Portland.
MRS. CLARENCE H. CORNING, Portland.
MRS. F. A. QUINBY, Portland.
MISS LOUISA SPRING, Portland.
MISS CATHERINE P. TALBOT, Portland.
MISS HANNAH L. TALBOT, Portland.
MISS MARY KING LONGFELLOW, Portland.
MISS ELINOR S. MOODY, Portland.
MISS MARION RICHMOND WEEKS, Portland.
MRS. JOHN M. GLIDDEN, Newcastle.
MRS. P. M. BLAKE, Bangor.
MRS. F. C. ROBINSON, Brunswick.

WASHINGTON, D. C. District Association

MRS. FRANK GOODWIN, President.

Honorary Vice-Presidents.

MRS. GEORGE WICKERSHAM,
MISS JANE RIGGS,
MISS MOLLY ELLIOTT SEAWELL,
MRS. KINGSBURY WATERMAN, Secretary.
MISS MARY McMULLEN, Treasurer.

Executive Committee

MRS. WILLIAM COGSWELL,
MISS NANNIE RANDOLPH HEATH,
MRS. J. H. HENSLEY,
MISS ELLA BREHAUT,
MRS. KINGSBURY WATERMAN,
MRS. GEORGE ARMES.

OHIO

MRS. HERMON M. HUBBARD, President.
MRS. J. A. JEFFREY, First Vice-President.
MRS. SAMUEL LEE, Second Vice-President.
MRS. LYMAN ARMS, Third Vice-President.
MRS. T. EWING MARTIN, Secretary.
MRS. WALTER H. MARTIN, Treasurer.

AN UNCERTAIN QUANTITY

(From the *Denver* (Colorado) *Republican*)

Experience in Denver has proved that the woman vote is an uncertain quantity, never to be relied upon. While many women demand it as a right, many refuse to go to the polls.